

being paid out then will depend on the productivity of the economy at the time, which in turn will depend heavily on the drag on the economy exerted by the next net that we will have accumulated by then.

The best guarantee, in other words, that there will be Social Security benefits available then is to reduce the deficit now. Yet by killing the balanced budget amendment, Conrad-Dorgan destroyed the very mechanism that would force that to happen. The one real effect, therefore, that Conrad-Dorgan will have on Social Security is to jeopardize the government's capacity to keep paying it.

Having done that, Conrad-Dorgan are now posing as the saviors of Social Security from Republican looters. A neat trick. A complete fraud.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this distinguished columnist, who has a knack for exposing attempts at political deception and making difficult things simple, points out the deceit in the arguments that we heard on the floor last week.

I encourage all who participated in the balanced budget amendment debate to read this column. I am asking that it be made part of the RECORD so everyone will have an opportunity to do that. Because, if nothing else, Mr. Krauthammer's essay brushes aside the political rhetoric and emphasizes that, no matter how you add it up, where you put the numbers, or, as he says, which pocket you put it in, an obligation of the Federal Government remains just that—an obligation of the Federal Government. And we or our children and grandchildren have to pay it.

Mr. President, it just seems to this Senator that the balanced budget amendment should have been adopted. I repeat for those who are worried about the Social Security trust fund or, more precisely, where will the money be, where will it come from to pay Social Security recipients 20, 25, 30 years from now, I submit that the best thing we could have done was to get the unified budget of the United States in balance in 7 years. Because I believe that would have more to do with what Social Security of the future needs than anything else.

Simply put, as Mr. Krauthammer later in his article alludes to, the best thing for Social Security in the future is a vibrant, growing American economy with low inflation. If we can have that for periods of 4 or 5 years at a time, with mild downturns, then I believe we will be in a position as a nation to take care of our seniors.

Frankly, Mr. President, if we cannot do that, we will not be in a position to take care of them no matter what rhetoric is offered on the floor that seemed to say, in the 7-year balanced budget that was before us, even though we would have to cut or reduce Government about \$1.2 trillion, essentially those who argued against it, at least from the Social Security standpoint, were saying that is not enough; you have to do more. And frankly, we have never come close to even that. I would have thought that would have been a

fantastic effort on behalf of senior Social Security citizens and on behalf of a prospering American economy.

I hope everyone will get a chance to read this very basic approach that this excellent columnist talks to us about with reference to the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESPONDING TO THE PEOPLE

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, I come to the floor during this morning business to talk about several things, to sort of reflect a little bit on the 2 months that we have been here, a little over 2 months.

First of all, of course, it is a great honor to be a part of this body and to represent the State of Wyoming in the U.S. Senate.

We have to observe that we have dealt with a limited number of items while we have been here. Many of us are filled with some kinds of mixed emotions, recognizing and respecting the deliberative nature of the Senate and, at the same time, having some frustration with the slowness of the deliberations and the lack of movement on some of the issues that we consider to be very important.

As an American, of course, I believe that we want our institutions to be thoughtful and to fully explore issues, but also in a timely way to decide and to move on. That is what deliberation is all about.

There is, I believe, an agenda in this country. Everyone can read the past election as they choose, but it seems pretty certain that a number of things were on the minds of American voters. One of them is that most people believe we have too much government, that it costs too much, that we need to have in our lives less government, less cost, and less regulation. Of course, you can talk about the details of how do you do that, but, nevertheless, it is an agenda.

These were issues that were defined in the last election and they are issues that need to be dealt with by this Congress and by this Senate. One of the measures of good government, I believe, is the responsiveness that its institutions have to the people as they vote.

We have, as a result of the election, I think, the best opportunity that has been before us for 40 years to take a look at some of the things we do. Over the last number of years, about all the opportunities available were to add to programs that we had, put more money in programs that we had. Now we have

a chance and we have a Congress that is willing to think through programs again and see if, in fact, they are delivering as they were designed to deliver.

In order to make this a useful discussion, of course, there has to be a stipulation that those who are interested in looking to change are just as caring and just as concerned about people as those who are opposed to change. And I think that is a fair and honest stipulation.

The question is what we are doing in seeing if there is a better way to provide services for the needy. Is there a better way to determine who those services should go to? Is there a more efficient way of delivering those services? That I think is what the change is about.

We need to have this institution to be the kind of institution that will take a look at these things and then move forward and decide.

We really do not need a rapid response team that is opposed to change. And the controversy—many of the issues are not between Republicans and Democrats—the controversy lies between those who would like to see some things done differently and those who basically do not want change.

There is a legitimate difference of view. There is a legitimate argument between those who think more government, more spending is better for the country, and those like myself, who do not agree, who think that, indeed, we can do it with less government, turning more of an opportunity for families to spend their own money, stimulating the economy.

We are now, today and in the next couple of days, debating the Kassebaum amendment with respect to replacement of strikers, an issue that we went through in the House and in the Senate last year in great detail. So I rise in strong support of that amendment. I think it is the will of the Congress. We have been through that. We have been through some 60 years of experience. Frankly, it has worked pretty well and there has been very little deviation from that in terms of hiring replacements.

Someone on the floor the other day said, "Is this the agenda of the new majority, to make it tougher for working people, to make it tougher for single mothers to have jobs?" Of course not. That is an absurd idea.

I think the idea of the new majority is to find a balance between labor and management, to find a way in which there is an environment where business can grow and jobs can be created, where the Federal Government is not an advocate for either of the parties in these kinds of controversies. I think that is what the Kassebaum amendment is all about.

Madam President, I thank you for the time. It is difficult to know how we should proceed. But there is a great deal before the Senate. We have a great many things to decide. In fact, we

should be deciding them. That is what votes are about. Once they have been totally explored, we look forward to making a decision and not to obstruct a decision.

I look forward very much to the continuing efforts on the part of this body to respond to voters, responding to the people in this country in making decisions on major items, in the first opportunity in many years we have had to explore finding ways to do things in a better way.

I think the war on poverty is a good example. It has been going on for what—30 years? Twenty years? The fact of the matter is we are less well off now than we were then in terms of the things that the war on poverty was designed to resolve. It makes it pretty clear, if you want different results, you have to start doing things differently. you cannot expect different results by continuing to do the same thing.

So I look forward to the continued discussion. I look forward to dealing with the issues that the House has dealt with. However the majority here decides to deal with them is fine; I just suggest we come to grips with them, that we move forward, that we do not lose the momentum of an election, that we do not lose the interest and the interest of the American people in taking a look at questions like a balanced budget amendment, like line-item veto, like term limits, like accountability. All of those are issues that really deserve our best attention and final decision.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as if in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Chair.

MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL IN TAMPA BAY

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate the birth of one of baseball's two newest members, the Tampa Bay Devil Rays. The Tampa Bay community was awarded a franchise last Thursday and will commence play in 1998. This is a very important and welcome, celebrated event for our State and particularly for the 2 million citizens of the Tampa Bay area who have been waiting a long, long time for baseball to come in the summer.

For many years, the Tampa Bay area has been home to spring training baseball, and for many years there has been the hope and expectation that baseball would not terminate as the teams left

to begin the regular season. That expectation will now be soon realized. This comes after many years of effort. The quest for a major league team began in 1977 with the formation of the Pinellas Sports Authority, an organization that has had as its goal to bring a major league franchise to the Tampa Bay area.

Since that time, there have been efforts to secure seven different franchises. In each case, there was the hope and the expectation that the franchise would be relocated to the Tampa Bay area, and then for a variety of reasons that hope was crushed.

The latest attempt occurred several years ago when an actual contract was signed for the relocation of the San Francisco Giants to Tampa Bay, and this contract was subsequently canceled by action of the other major league teams.

During the course of this activity, working with the various series of major league baseball commissioners, the city determined that it was in its interest and would advance its potential as a major league franchise by proceeding to construct a state of the art domed stadium, which has now been completed, which is utilized for other sports activities and which stands ready with modifications and final refinements to be the home to the new Tampa Bay Devil Rays professional team.

In achieving this success, there were many people who were active. I would like to particularly express my appreciation to the managing general partner of the new team, Mr. Vince Naimoli, who, over a period of setbacks and frustrations, remained constant in his commitment to bring major league baseball to Tampa Bay. There have been many officials with the Saint Petersburg city government who have been active in helping to realize this objective.

I should like to recognize Saint Petersburg City Administrator Rick Dodge, who, from the very beginning, has played a crucial role in helping to move toward the completion of the stadium and maintaining a high level of community support behind the effort to receive a major league franchise. He is illustrative of dozens of others—elected officials, city administration officials, and the citizens of Pinellas County—who have worked so hard to bring this to a successful realization.

Madam President, we are proud of the recognition of this awarded franchise to the important position which the State of Florida plays in major league professional athletics. With this award, our State will now have nine major league franchises in baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, second only to California in the number of professional major league teams playing in the State. This is appropriate to the size and rapid growth of our State and its demonstrated support for professional sports.

Madam President, I thank the major league baseball ownership for awarding this franchise to Tampa Bay. They have demonstrated wisdom in doing so because I am confident that this will quickly become one of the strongest franchises in major league baseball. There is a certain degree of optimism in accepting a major league franchise in the context of the current labor-management status, but I am confident well before 1998 we will be playing major league baseball again in America and look forward to the day when the Tampa Bay Devil Rays open their first season.

Madam President, thank you for affording me this opportunity to make these remarks on behalf of the citizens of our State and the event that we have long looked forward to celebrating.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended for 10 additional minutes, and that I be recognized for that period of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair.

REPORTING OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I rise today to comment on the RECORD made earlier this morning by my distinguished colleague from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, the chairman of our Budget Committee. Let me say at the outset that I have the highest regard for Senator DOMENICI. He is very conscientious, very hard-working, and very honest in his beliefs and his work in the Senate. So in rising I do not intend to reflect on him, but rather to reflect on Charles Krauthammer's recent article concerning Social Security that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico included in the RECORD.

So there will not be any trouble referring to it, I ask unanimous consent that the article of Charles Krauthammer entitled "Social Security 'Trust Fund' Whopper" of last Friday, March 10 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 1995]

SOCIAL SECURITY "TRUST FUND" WHOPPER

(By Charles Krauthammer)

Last week, Sens. Kent Conrad and Byron Dorgan managed to (1) kill the balanced budget amendment, (2) deal Republicans their first big defeat since November and (3) make Democrats the heroes of Social Security. A hat trick. How did they do it? By demanding that any balanced budget amendment "take Social Security off the table"—